

Exhibit D

STULL, STULL & BRODY

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

6 EAST 45TH STREET
SUITE 500
NEW YORK, NY 10017
TELEPHONE: (212) 687-7230
FACSIMILE: (212) 490-2022

10940 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SUITE 2300
LOS ANGELES, CA 90024
TELEPHONE: (310) 209-2468
FACSIMILE: (310) 209-2087

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF STULL, STULL & BRODY

Over the past 30 years, Stull, Stull & Brody has developed a national reputation representing plaintiffs in securities class actions. Stull, Stull & Brody has litigated hundreds of securities cases obtaining nearly a billion dollars in settlements for aggrieved shareholders. Stull, Stull & Brody has also represented claimants in numerous class actions alleging violations of ERISA. With 15 attorneys and a full complement of secretarial and administrative personnel, Stull, Stull & Brody is capable of effectively prosecuting all types of complex litigation. Our lawyers possess outstanding credentials and have repeatedly been acknowledged for their achievements.

Stull, Stull & Brody has been recognized by numerous Courts for the high quality of its legal representation and for its excellence in the field of securities as evidenced by the following comments of judges in cases where Stull, Stull & Brody has taken a leading role:

[T]his is one of the largest, if not the largest, securities fraud settlements in this district. The settlement size is particularly noteworthy as class counsel did not have the benefit of an SEC or other regulatory agency investigation and so prosecuted the case without assistance. . . . The management of the case was also of extremely high quality. . . . [C]lass counsel is of high caliber and has extensive experience in similar class action litigation. Each of the co-lead counsel firms has a national reputation for advocacy in securities class actions, and there is no doubt that this standing enhanced their ability to prosecute the case effectively and to negotiate credibly. . . . The submissions were of consistently high quality, and class counsel has been notably diligent in preparing filing in a

timely manner even when under tight deadlines. *In re Ikon Office Solutions, Inc Securities Litigation*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6510 (E.D. Pa. May 9, 2000).

I am satisfied that counsel in this case are highly competent, very skilled in this very specialized area and were at all times during the course of the litigation . . . well prepared, well spoken, []knew their stuff and []were a credit to their profession. They are the top of the line. *In Re Electro-Catheter Corporation Securities Litigation*, Civ. No. 87-41 (D.N.J. September 7, 1989).

The court takes note of the competence of both plaintiffs' counsel and defendants' counsel and their extensive experience in litigating securities class actions. The competence of plaintiffs' counsel resulted in this case being vigorously and efficiently prosecuted against very able opponents over a twenty month period and was a factor in bringing about settlement. *Schaffer v. Timberland Co.*, 94-634-JD (D.N.H. 1997).

This case is a "model for how commercial litigation should be conducted and can be resolved." *Bash v. Diagnostek*, CV 94-794 M (D.N.M.).

Indeed, I indicate to . . .counsel for plaintiff that they have done an admirable job in this case in bringing it to finality and in bringing back to the shareholders of this corporation some moneys [sic] as a result of certain things which occurred during the course of the operation of this corporation which perhaps should not have occurred. *Finkel v. O'Brien*, Civ. No. 85-2539 (D.N.J. March 27, 1990).

All the firms involved in this litigation are highly experienced and well respected, particularly in the field of securities law litigation. The Stull . . . firm [is one] of this area's, if not the nation's most active and successful law firms specializing in securities litigation. *Stull v. Baker*, 410 F.Supp. 1326, 1332 (S.D.N.Y. 1976).

Stull, Stull & Brody's expertise in the field of securities litigation has also been recognized by the following courts: *In re Frontier Group Insurance, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 172 F.R.D. 31 (E.D.N.Y. 1997); *In re Allegheny International Inc. Shareholder Litigation*, 86-835 (W.D. Pa.) (Order, December 10, 1987, Diamond J.); *Zucker v. United States Steel*, C-1-79-588 (S.D. Ohio) (Order, October 14, 1981, Rubin, C.J.); *Friedman v. Colgate Palmolive*, 80 Civ. 2340 (CPS) (E.D. N.Y.) (Order, June 16, 1981, Sifton, J.); *Zuckerman v. Sparton*, G79-457-C.A. (W.D. Mich.) (Opinion and Order, April 14, 1981, Fox, J.); *Mottoros v. Abrams*, 524 F.Supp. 254 (N.D. Ill. 1981); *Koenig v. Smith*, 79 C 452

(ERN) (E.D.N.Y.) (Memorandum Opinion and Order, December 3, 1980, Neaher, J.); *Koenig v. Kenneally*, 79 Civ. 0487 (LBS) (S.D.N.Y.) (Opinion No. 49289, November 5, 1979, Sand, J.); *In Re Commonwealth Oil-Tesoro Petroleum Securities Litigation*, MDL No. 347 (Order, July 24, 1979, Higginbotham, J.); *Wietschner v. McCulloch*, CV 78-4036-RMT (C.D. Ca.) (Order, June 29, 1979, Takasugi, J.); *Fruchthandler v. LTV Corp.*, 77C 1879 (E.D.N.Y.) (Order, May 10, 1978, Nickerson, J.); *Lewis v. Adikes*, 76 F.R.D. 68 (E.D.N.Y. 1977); *Lewis v. Black*, [1976-77 Transfer Binder] Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶195,738 (E.D.N.Y. 1976) (Mishler, C.J.); *Fruchthandler v. Blakely*, 73 F.R.D. 318 (S.D.N.Y. 1976).

SEMINAL CASES

Throughout its 30 year history, Stull, Stull & Brody has been involved with a number of seminal cases that have significantly affected the landscape of securities litigation.

- ◆ In *Rand v. Monsanto Company*, 926 F.2d 596 (7th Cir. 1991), the firm appeared for the plaintiff in a landmark decision establishing the principle that a representative plaintiff need not be willing to bear all costs of an action to satisfy the adequacy of representation requirement.
- ◆ In *Small v. Fritz Companies Inc.*, 30 Cal.4th 167 (2003), the firm successfully argued before the California Supreme Court that a non-trading shareholder has the right to sue a corporation for damages where the shareholder relies on false financial statements issued by the corporation. The decision represented a significant doctrinal change and was widely heralded as a potent new weapon for investors.
- ◆ In *Lewis v. Black*, 74 F.R.D. 1 (E.D.N.Y. 1975), the firm established that neither the personality nor the motive of a proposed class representative was determinative of whether he would provide vigorous advocacy for the class, thereby preventing defendant corporations from compelling representatives to respond to questions regarding motives and actions in past cases.
- ◆ In *In re Cabletron Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 311 F.3d 11 (1st Cir. 2002), the firm was instrumental in obtaining a reversal of a dismissal of a complaint under the pleading requirements of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act. This case established in the First Circuit that plaintiffs are not required to provide the names of informants in a complaint.
- ◆ In *In re Frontier Group Insurance Litigation*, Master File No. 94 Civ. 5213

(E.D.N.Y. 2002), the firm was instrumental in defeating a *Daubert* challenge and sustained the ability of the expert to testify as to aggregate damages based on the use of a trading model.

- ◆ In *Harman v. Lyphomed, Inc.*, 122 F.R.D. 522 (N.D. Ill. 1988) the firm established the applicability of the fraud-on-the-market theory of reliance for stocks trading on NASDAQ.
- ◆ The firm was instrumental in establishing new law on "fraud on the market" theory in the 5th Circuit decision of *Finkel v. Docutel/Olivetti Corporation*, 817 F.2d 356 (5th Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 485 U.S. 959 (1988), and, in the Northern District of Illinois decision of *Mottoros v. Abrams*, 524 F.Supp. 254 (N.D. Ill. 1981).

As a lead counsel, Stull, Stull & Brody has successfully litigated hundreds of actions, recovering nearly a billion dollars on behalf of defrauded shareholders. A sampling of these cases in which Stull, Stull & Brody had a leading role include:

- *In re BankAmerica Corp. Securities Litigation*, MDL No. 1264 (E.D. Mo. 2002) (recovery of \$333.2 million)
- *In re Geodyne Resources, Inc. Securities Litigation* (Harris County Tex.) (recovery of \$200 million)
- *In re Computer Associates Sec. Litig.*, Master File No. 98-CV-4839 (TCP) (E.D.N.Y. 2003) (recovery of 5.7 million shares (estimated at \$134 million))
- *In re Ikon Office Solutions, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6510 (E.D. Pa. May 9, 2000) (recovery of \$111 million)
- *Morse v. Abbott Laboratories*, C.A. No. 90 C 1982 (N.D. Ill. 1994) (jury verdict of \$15 million)
- *In re Salomon Brothers Treasury Litigation*, Consolidated Action No. 91 Civ. 5471 (RPP) (S.D.N.Y. 1994) (recovery of \$100 million)
- *In re Westinghouse Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No. 91-354 (W.D. Pa. 1999) (recovery of \$67.25 million)
- *In re Peregrine Systems, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Civil Action No. 02-CV-870 J (RBB) (S.D. Ca. 2006) (recovery of \$56.29 million)
- *In re Thomas & Betts Securities Litigation*, Case No. 00-2127 (W.D. Tenn. 2002) - related case: *Pifko v. KPMG LLP*, Civ. Action No. 01-CV-2553 (W.D. Tenn. 2004) (recovery of \$51.15 million)
- *In re Tenneco Inc. Securities Litigation*, Civ. Action No. H-91-2010 (S.D. Tex. 1992) (recovery of \$50 million)

- *In re Apria Healthcare Group Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 797060 (Superior Court of California, Orange County) (recovery of \$42 million)
- *Thomas Levitan v. John B. McCoy, Jr., et al.*, Case No. 00 C 5096 (N.D. Ill. 2006) (recovery of \$39.9 million)
- *In re Cannon Group Securities Litigation*, 86-5559-WMB (JRx) (C.D. Ca. 1988) (recovery of \$33 million)
- *Teichler v. DSC Communications Corporation*, CA 3-85-2005-T (N.D. Tex. 1990) (recovery of \$30 million)
- *Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp.*, Civ. Action No. 98-1148 (S.D. Tex. 2002) (recovery of \$28.65 million)
- *In re: Northeast Utilities Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No. 397 CV 00189 AVC (D. Ct.) (recovery of \$25 million)
- *Lasky v. Brown (United Companies Financial Corporation) Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No. 99-1035-B-M2 (M.D. La. 2002) (recovery of \$20.5 million)
- *Feinberg v. Hibernia Corp.*, Civil Action No. 90-4245 (E.D. La. 1995) (recovery of \$20 million)
- *In re Dreyfus Aggressive Growth Mutual Fund Litigation*, Master File No. 98 Civ. 4318 (HB) (S.D.N.Y.) (recovery of \$18.5 million)
- *In re C.R. Bard, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 90-948 (AMW) (D.N.J. 1991) (recovery of \$17.9 million)
- *Spring v. Continental Illinois Corporation*, 84 C 4648 (N.D. Ill. 1987) (recovery of \$17.5 million)
- *In re Green Tree Financial Corporation Stock Litigation*, Master File No. 97-2666 (JRT/RLE) (D. Minn. 2003) (\$12.45 million)
- *In re Elscint Securities Litigation*, Civ. Action No. 85-2662-K (D. Mass. 1989) (recovery of \$12 million)
- *In re National Medical Enterprises Securities Litigation II*, Case No. CV 93-5224 TJH (Bx) (C.D. Ca.) (recovery of \$11.65 million)
- *Bash v. Diagnostic, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 94-784 (D.N.M.) (recovery of \$10.7 million)
- *In re Cybermedia, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 98-1811CBM (Ex) (C.D. Ca.) (recovery of \$10.5 million)

- *In re Cabletron Systems, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, C 97-542 (D.R.I. 2006) (recovery of \$10.5 million)
- *In re Physicians Corp. of America Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 97-3678-CIV (S.D. Fla. 2003) (recovery of \$10.2 million)
- *In re Complete Management Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Master File No. 99 Civ. 1454 (NRB) (S.D.N.Y.) (recovery of \$10.15 million)
- *In re U.S.A. Detergent Securities Litigation*, 97-CV-2459 (D.N.J. 1999) (recovery of \$10 million)
- *In re Trump Hotels Shareholder Derivative Litig.*, 98-Civ-7820 (GEL) (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (recovery of assets for corporation valued in the range of \$10 million)
- *In re Nice Systems, Ltd. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 2:01 CV 737 (Judge Greenaway) (D.N.J. 2003) (recovery of \$10 million)
- *Harman v. Lyphomed*, 88 C 476 (N.D. Ill. 1989) (recovery of \$9.99 million)
- *In re Beverly Enterprises, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. CV 88-01189-RSWL (Tx) (C.D. Ca. 1992) (recovery of \$9.975 million)
- *Greenfield v. Compuserve Corp.*, Case No. 96-CV-06-4810 (Franklin County, Ohio) (recovery of \$9.5 million)
- *In re Stratosphere Securities Litigation*, Master File No. CV-S-96-00708-PMP (RLH) (D. Nev.) (recovery of \$9 million)
- *In re Steven Madden Ltd. Securities Litigation*, No. 00-CV-3676 (JG) (E.D.N.Y. 2002) (recovery of \$9 million)
- *In re Gibraltar Financial Corporation Securities Litigation*, CV 87-07876 MRP (Gx) (C.D. Ca. 1989) (recovery of \$8.5 million)
- *In re FHP Securities Litigation*, Master File No. SACV 91-580-GLT (RWRx) (C.D. Ca. 1992) (recovery of \$8.25 million)
- *Zucker v. Maxicare Health Plans, Inc.*, Case No. 88-02499-LEW (Tx) (C.D. Ca. 1991) (recovery of \$8.1 million)
- *In re Orion Pictures Corp. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 91 CV 1903 (CBA) (E.D.N.Y. 1992) (recovery of \$8 million)
- *Berlinsky v. Alcatel*, 94-CIV-9084 CBM (S.D.N.Y.) (recovery of \$8 million)
- *In re Triton Energy Corporation Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 3:92-CV-1069-H (N.D. Tex. 1993) (recovery of \$8 million)

- *In re Cityscape*, CV 97 5668 (E.D.N.Y.) (recovery of \$7 million)
- *In re Dime Savings Bank of New York Securities Litigation*, MDL Docket No. 846 (E.D.N.Y. 1993) (recovery of \$6.8 million)
- *In re Western Digital Securities Litigation*, SACV 91-375(A) GLT (RWRx) (C.D. Ca.) (recovery of \$6.75 million)
- *In re Bank of New England Corporation Class Action and Shareholder Litigations*, C.A. Nos. 89-2582-S, 89-2811-S (D. Mass. 1992) (recovery of \$6.5 million)
- *In re Berkshire Realty Company, Inc. Shareholder Litigation*, C.A. No. 17242 (Delaware Chancery Court 2004) (recovery of \$6.25 million)
- *Gerstein v. Micron Technology, Inc., et al.*, Civil No. 89-1262 (D. Id. 1993) (recovery of \$6 million)
- *In re Ziff-Davis, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 98-CIV-7158 (SWK) (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (recovery of \$6 million)
- *Dynegy Inc., et al. v. Bernard V. Shapiro, et al.*, No. 2002-00080, in the 129th Judicial District, Harris County, Texas (recovery of \$6 million)
- *In re Ascend Communications Securities Litigation*, Case No. 97-9376 MRP (AN) (C.D. Ca. 2002) (recovery of \$5.45 million)
- *In re Brightpoint, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. IP 01 1796 C-T/K (recovery of \$5.25 million)
- *Kushner v. Wang Laboratories*, Civil Action No. 89-1963-Y (D. Mass. 1994) (recovery of \$5 million)
- *In re SouthEast Banking Corp. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 90-0760-CIV-MOORE (S.D. Fla. 1993) (recovery of \$5 million)
- *Wells v. Southmark Corporation, et al.*, CA3-85-1518-G (N.D. Tex. 1992) (recovery of \$5 million)
- *In re Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No. 03 CV 311 (RWS) (S.D.N.Y. 2005) (recover of \$4.7 million)
- *In re Sunglass Hut Intl., Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 97-0191-CIV-MOORE (S.D. Fl. 2001) (recovery of \$4.5 million)
- *Clive T. Miller v. Apropos Technology, Inc., et al.*, No. 01 C 8406 (N.D. Ill. 2004) (recovery of \$4.5 million)
- *In re Fidelity Holdings Securities Litigation*, Case No. CV 00 5078 (CPS) (VVP) (E.D.N.Y. 2003) (recovery of \$4.45 million)

- *Adam Burstyn, et al. v. Worldwide Xceed Group, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 01 CV 1125 (GEL) (S.D.N.Y. 2005)(recovery of \$4.4 million)
- *In re NetEase.com Sec. Litig.*, Civil Action No. 01-CV-9405 (RO) (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (recovery of \$4.35 million)
- *In re Flextronics, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. C-03-2102 PJH (N.D. Ca. 2004) (recovery of \$4.25 million)
- *Schaffer v. Timberland Co.*, 94-634-JD (D.N.H. 1997) (recovery of \$4.2 million)
- *In re HMO America Securities Litigation*, Civ. No. 92 C 3305 (CPK) (N.D. Ill. 1993) (recovery of \$4 million)
- *In re Nanophase Technologies Corporation Securities Litigation*, Case No. 98 C 3450 (N.D. Ill.) (recovery of \$4 million)
- *In re Quintex Securities Litigation*, Master File No. CV-89-6182-R (C.D. Ca. 1990) (recovery of \$4 million)
- *Walsingham v. Biocontrol Tech. Inc.*, Civil Action No. 96-809 (W.D. Pa.) (recovery of \$3.7 million)
- *In re Irvine Sensors Corp. Sec. Litig.*, Master File No. SA 02-00159 GLT (MLGx) (C.D. Ca. 1994) (recovery of \$3.5 million)
- *In re iTurf Inc. Shareholders Litigation*, Consolidated Civil Action No. 18242 NC (Delaware Chancery Court) (recovery of \$3.25 million)
- *In re Safety Kleen Rollins Shareholder Litig.*, Case No. 3:00-1343-17 (D.S.C. 2005)(recovery of \$3.15 million)
- *In re Kay Jewelers Securities Litigation*, Civil Action No. 90-1663A (E.D. Va. 1991) (recovery of \$3 million)
- *Clarkson v. Greyhound Lines, Inc.*, 96-11329-C (Dist. Ct., Dallas County, Tex.) (recovery of \$3 million)
- *In re TwinLab Corp. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 00-CV-6975 (DRH) (E.D.N.Y. 2005) (recover of \$3 million)
- *In re Spectrian Corp. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. C-97-4672-CW (N.D. Ca.) (recovery of \$2.975 million)
- *Moriarty v. Molina*, Case No. 99-0255-CIV-MORENO (S.D. Fla. 2003) (recovery of \$2.8 million)
- *In re Peritus Software Services, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Civ. Action No.

98CV10955 WGY (D. Mass. 2000) (recovery of \$2.8 million)

- *In re 2TheMart.com, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 99-1127 DOC (ANx) (C.D. Ca. 2002) (recovery of \$2.7 million)
- *McBride v. Vision Twenty-One, Inc.*, Case No. 99-138-CIV-T-25F (M.D. Fl. 2003) (recovery of \$2.5 million)
- *In re Pharmaprint Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Civ. No. 00-61 (AJL) (D.N.J. 2003) (recovery of \$2.3 million)

Stull, Stull & Brody is presently serving as plaintiffs' lead or co-lead counsel in a number of pending actions in various district courts, including:

Securities Class Action Cases

- *In re American Express Financial Advisors Sec. Litig.*, Civil Action No. 1:04-CV-1773 (DAB) (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Sharon Bobbitt v. Andrew J. Filiposki, et al.*, No. 03 C 3599 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re FleetBoston Financial Corp. Sec. Litig.*, Civ. No. 02-4561 (WGB) (D.N.J.)
- *In re Light Management Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Civil Action No. 02-CV-3345 (RO) (S.D.N.Y.)
- *In re Merck & Co., Inc., Securities, Derivative & "ERISA: Litig.*, MDL No. 1658 (SRC), Case No. 2:05-CV-01151-SRC-MF, (D.N.J.) Case No. 2:05-CV-02367-SRC-MF (D.N.J.)
- *In re Metris Companies, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Civil Action No. 02-CV-3677 JMR/FLN (D. Minn.)
- *In re Mutual Funds Investment Litig.*, MDL 1586, Case No. 04-MD-15863 (JFM) (D. Md.); *Parthasarathy v. RS Investment Management, L.P., et al.*, Case No. 04-cv-3798-JFM (D. Md.)
- *In re Peregrine Systems, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Civil Action No. 02-CV-870 J (RBB) (S.D. Ca.) (for Securities Act of 1933 claims)
- *In re Priceline.com, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, Master File No. 3:00CV01884 (AVC) (D. Conn.)
- *In re Rambus Securities Class Action Litigation*, Master File No. CO6-4346 JF (N.D. Calif.)
- *In re Rhythms Sec. Litig.*, Civil Action No. 02-K-35 (GCL) (D. Co.)
- *In re Xerox Sec. Litig.*, Civil Action No. 3:99 CV 2374 (AWT) (D. Ct.)

ERISA Class Action Cases

- *In re AEP ERISA Litigation*, Master File No. C2-03-67 (S.D. Ohio)
- *In re AOL Time Warner ERISA Litigation*, Civil Action No. 02 CV 8853 (SWK) (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Harrington v. Household International, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 02 C 8257 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re Lucent Technologies, Inc. ERISA Litig.*, Civil Action No. 01-cv-3491 (JAP) (D.N.J.)
- *In re Sears, Roebuck & Co. ERISA Litig.*, No. 02 C 8324 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re Sprint Corporation ERISA Litig.*, Master File No. 2:03-CV-02202-JWL (D. Kan.)
- *Overby v. Tyco International, Ltd.*, Case No. 02-CV-1357-B (D.N.H.)

Stull, Stull & Brody's advocacy in these and other ERISA class actions, which have been brought on behalf of 401(k) retirement plan participants and beneficiaries, has also yielded new law in the ERISA field. For example, in the *Lucent* ERISA litigation the firm was largely responsible for a frequently-cited ruling by the District Court dated February 11, 2002, where the Court denied a motion to stay the ERISA litigation against Lucent until resolution of a related securities class action against the company. Stull, Stull & Brody's briefing on the stay motion pointed out the many significant differences between ERISA and securities class actions, even when the ERISA and securities cases involve the same factual issues. The District Court ultimately ruled that "resolution of the securities class action . . . will not necessarily resolve all issues in this matter" and "[t]he legal issues here will still have to be determined, and a stay or continuance shall not change that fact."

ATTORNEYS

Stull, Stull & Brody maintains offices in both New York and Los Angeles. The following section sets forth basic educational and experience information for each of

Stull, Stull & Brody's attorneys.

NEW YORK

Jules Brody is a graduate of Brooklyn College, *magna cum laude*, and received his L.L.B. from the New York University School of Law in 1964. Mr. Brody made the Dean's List and was an editor of the Law Review. Mr. Brody was the author of "The Equitable Power to Assess Counsel Fees" which was published in the New York University Intramural Law Review in May 1964. At NYU, Mr. Brody was a John Norton Pomeroy Scholar and received the American Jurisprudence Prize in Commercial Law and graduated in the top 10% of his class. He was admitted to the New York State Bar in 1964. Mr. Brody received his LL.M. in taxation from the graduate division of the NYU School of Law in 1967. Mr. Brody is also admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Fourth and Fifth Circuits, and has been specially admitted to practice before various district courts throughout the United States.

Edwin J. Mills is Of Counsel to Stull, Stull & Brody. He is a graduate of Fordham University and received his J.D. from Brooklyn Law School in 1977. Mr. Mills was admitted to practice in the State of New York and in the Eastern District of New York in 1978. He has represented classes of purchasers of securities and shareholders for over 20 years in federal and state courts throughout the United States. He is experienced in all aspects of securities class action litigation, including settlement negotiation and trial. Mr. Mills is also active in several large ERISA class action cases brought on behalf of 401(k) retirement plan participants and beneficiaries, including cases involving Lucent Technologies, Household International, Tyco International, Conesco, American Electric Power and Sears.

Mark Levine is a graduate of the University of Maryland and received his J.D. from Brooklyn Law School in 1981. He was admitted to the New York State Bar in 1982 and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Southern, Western and Eastern Districts of New York and the Northern District of Illinois, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Fourth, Sixth, Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Circuits, and has been specially admitted to practice before various other state and federal courts. He has participated in the litigation of securities class actions throughout the United States.

Howard T. Longman received his undergraduate degree from the University of Virginia and his J.D. from New York Law School in 1982. Mr. Longman is a member of the New York State Bar and has also been admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Patrick K. Slyne received his J.D. from the University of Wyoming in 1988. He is a member of the Colorado, Connecticut and Wyoming state bars.

Melissa R. Emert received her undergraduate degree from the State University of New York at Stony Brook and her J.D. from Brooklyn Law School in 1988. Ms. Emert is a member of the New York State Bar and has also been admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Aaron L. Brody received his undergraduate degree from Yeshiva University, *summa cum laude*, Class of 1990, and his J.D. from New York University School of Law in

1995. At NYU, Mr. Brody concentrated on securities law and was a staff editor on the *Review of Law and Social Change*. Mr. Brody is a member of the New York State Bar and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Tzivia Brody received her undergraduate degree from Stern College, *magna cum laude*, Class of 1992, and her J.D. from the Benjamin M. Cardozo School of Law in 1995. Ms. Brody is a member of the New York State Bar and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Jason D'Agnenica received his undergraduate degree from Providence College in 1995, B.A., *cum laude*, and his J.D. from St. John's University School of Law in 1998. While at St. John's, Mr. D'Agnenica participated in the Moot Court Honor Society advocacy competition and represented clients in consumer protection matters through St. John's Elder Law Clinic. Mr. D'Agnenica also served as judicial intern for Magistrate Judge Timothy M. Boudewyns, United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island. Mr. D'Agnenica is a member of the New Jersey State Bar and is admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey and the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Menashe Y. Shapiro received his undergraduate degree from Yeshiva University, *cum laude*, Class of 1997, and his J.D. from Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in 2000. Mr. Shapiro is a member of the New Jersey State Bar and is admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey and the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

James Henry Glavin IV received his undergraduate degree from Boston College, Class of 1999, and his J.D. from Fordham University School of Law in 2002. While at Fordham, Mr. Glavin served as an editor on the Moot Court Board and International Law Journal. Mr. Glavin is a member of the New York State Bar and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

Michael J. Klein received his undergraduate degree in 2001 from Emory University and his J.D., with honors, from the University of Connecticut School of Law in 2004. While at the University of Connecticut, Mr. Klein served as an executive editor of the Connecticut Law Review. Mr. Klein is a member of the New York and Connecticut State Bars and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

James E. Lahm received his undergraduate degree from The Ohio State University and his J.D. from Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in 2004. Mr. Lahm is a member of the New Jersey State Bar and is admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York and the District of New Jersey.

LOS ANGELES OFFICE

Patrice L. Bishop received her undergraduate degree from New York University and her J.D. from Loyola Law School - Los Angeles in 1994. Ms. Bishop is a member of the California State Bar and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth and Ninth Circuit.

Timothy J. Burke graduated *magna cum laude* from Suffolk University and received his J.D. from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1995. Mr. Burke is a member of the California State Bar, and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.